



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

reply to it? "Celsus," he says, "charges us that we shun the erection of altars, statues, and temples; but he does not see that, with us, the soul of every pious man is an altar, from which true and spiritual incense is sent up—namely, the prayers offered by a pure conscience. From whence St. John says, in the Apocalypse: 'The odours are the prayers of the saints;' and the Psalmist writes, 'Let my prayer be set forth in thy sight as the incense.' But statues and offerings suitable to God are not those which are made by ignoble artizans, but those which are formed and fashioned by God's word within us—namely, the imitations of those virtues of temperance, justice, fortitude, wisdom, piety, and the other qualities by which we resemble Christ, who is the 'first begotten of every creature.' Whoever, therefore, in obedience to the Divine word, cultivates these virtues, is in possession of those statues by which we are persuaded that it is right to honour the prototype of all statues, the only begotten God, the image of the invisible God."⁸

Again, Origen uses still more emphatic language in another part of the same treatise. "We deem those," saith he, "the most ignorant, who are not ashamed to address lifeless things, to petition the weak for help, to ask life from the dead, to pray for help from the most despicably needy. And, though some may allege that these images are not gods, but only their symbols and representations, even such persons fancying that imitations of the Deity can be made by the hands of some mean artizan are not a whit less ignorant, and slavish, and uneducated. From this sottish stupidity, the very lowest and least informed of us Christians are exempt."⁹

We very much fear that there are many Roman Catholics of the present day who, when they offer up their prayers before the image of some favourite saint, would come under the censure of Origen, for "addressing lifeless things, petitioning the weak for help, or asking life from the dead." Nay, how often do we hear the plea put forward which Origen places in the mouth of a defender of heathen image-worship—namely, that the images are only "the symbols or representations" of the beings to whom the prayers are offered. How scornfully does Origen reject such a poor evasion! "From this sottish stupidity, the very lowest and least informed of us Christians are exempt"—(ὡς τοὺς ἐσχάτους τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν ἀπὸ τῆς αἰσεσθῆτος καὶ τῆς ἀμαθίας). If Origen were alive at the present day, we ask, could he make the same defence for Roman Christianity now?

Our next authority is Arnobius, another Christian apologist. "Yon Pagans allege," he writes, "that you worship the gods through the medium of images. What then? Even if there were no images in existence, could the gods be ignorant that they were worshipped; could the gods fancy that you paid them no honours? You tell us, that they receive your prayers and supplications through a sort of go-betweens; and, before they know what worship is due to them, you make offerings to the images, and transmit, as it were, the remains of your devotion to the gods. Now, what can be more injurious, more contumelious, more hard, than to have the knowledge of God, and yet to supplicate another thing; than to expect assistance from a deity, and yet to offer prayers to a senseless representation?"¹⁰

The same argument is insisted on with much force by others of the early Christian writers. Thus, for example, the Christian speaker, in the dialogue of Minucius Felix, is represented as using the following language to his Pagan antagonist:—"It is manifest that your gods were mere men, whom we know both to have been born and to have died. Yet who doubts that the vulgar adore and publicly worship their consecrated images? How comes one of these gods into existence? Why, truly, he is cast in a mould, or he is hewn out of a block, or he is carved with a tool. As yet, however, he is not a god. Lo! he is ballasted, he is hoisted up, he is set fairly on his legs. Still, nevertheless, he is not a god. At last he is ornamented, he is consecrated, he is adored! Now, then, at length he is a god at last!" Would not one think that the Christian apologist had been an actual witness of the erection of the statue or image of some favourite Roman Catholic saint in modern times, and was describing the scene in terms of bitter and contemptuous irony?

Our next witness shall be the eminent writer, Lactantius. "What madness is it," he exclaims, "for men either to fashion images, which they themselves may afterwards fear, or to fear images which they themselves have fashioned! 'We do not fear,' say they, 'the images themselves; but we fear those beings after whose similitude they are fashioned, and by whose names they are consecrated.' Why, then, do you not lift up your eyes to heaven? Why do you turn to walls, and stocks, and stones, rather than look thither, where you believe your God to be?"¹¹

The entire passage is too long to be transcribed; but nothing can be clearer from its whole tenor than that all uses of images was condemned in the Christian Church in his time. We can only find room for one extract more.—"If," saith he, "a man should make an image of his absent friend, that he might comfort himself in looking at it, would he be deemed in his right mind if he should persist in look-

ing at the image, after his friend had returned—nay, if he would rather look at it than his friend? Certainly not. For the image of a man appears necessary when he is absent, but it is useless when he is present. God, however, whose spirit and deity is everywhere diffused, can never be absent. Therefore, an image is always useless. (Semper utique imago supervacanea est.)"

We will only add the well-known passage from Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, who lived towards the close of the fourth century. "I entered," saith he, "into a certain church to pray; I found there a linen cloth hanging on the church door, painted, and having on it the image of Christ, as it were, or of some other saint (for I remember not well whose image it was); therefore, when I did see the image of a man hanging in the church of Christ, contrary to the authority of the Scriptures, I did tear it, and gave counsel to the keepers of the church that they should wrap a poor man that was dead in the said cloth, and so bury him." This epistle was deemed of such authority by St. Jerome, that he translated it into Latin, in order that it might be read in the Western Churches.¹² It is plain, therefore, from the circumstance just described, that Epiphanius judged it contrary to the Christian religion and the authority of the Scriptures to have any images in Christ's Church. Even a painted figure excited his displeasure; and it mattered not whether it were the picture of Christ or of any saint. And, further, we may observe that Epiphanius not only removed the picture out of the church, but, with a vehement zeal, tare it in sunder, and exhorted that a corpse should be wrapped and buried in it, judging it fit for nothing but to rot in the earth. Herein he followed the example of the good king Hezekiah, who brake the brazen serpent in pieces (2 Kings xviii. 4), and burned it to ashes, because it had been a cause of idolatry to the Israelites. It is manifest, then, that since Jerome, who translated the epistle of Epiphanius, has not written anything against his judgment concerning images, nor has he been censured by any other writer of that time, we have here a plain and evident proof that in those days, which were about four hundred years after Christ, there were no images publicly received and used in the Christian Church.

We had intended making some remarks on the attempts made by Roman Catholic writers to weaken or evade the force of the testimonies which we have quoted; but as we are unwilling to exhaust the patience of our readers, we must defer them to another occasion. Meanwhile, we will conclude with the remarks made by an old English writer, who had examined this subject three centuries ago, and who had ample opportunities of observing the evil consequences of the introduction of images into the religious services of a professedly Christian Church. He writes, as he felt, strongly; but the homely good sense of his remarks goes far to justify the plain terms he uses, in speaking of this corruption of Christian doctrine and practice. He writes as follows:—

"True religion, then, and pleasing of God, consisteth not in making, setting up, painting, gilding, clothing, and decking of dumb and dead images (which be but great puppets and babies for old fools in dotage, and wicked idolatry, to dally and play with), nor in kissing of them, capping, kneeling, offering to them, incensing of them, setting up of candles, hanging up of legs, arms, or whole bodies of wax before them, or praying and asking of them, or of saints, things belonging only to God to give. But all these things be vain and abominable and sinful before God. Wherefore all such do not only bestow their money and labour in vain, but with their pains and cost purchase to themselves God's utter indignation. For ye have heard it evidently proved by God's word, the doctors of the Church, ecclesiastical histories, reason, and experience, that images have been and be worshipped by infinite multitudes, to the great offence of God's majesty, and danger of infinite souls; and that idolatry cannot possibly be separated from images set up in chambers and temples, gilded and decked gloriously, and that therefore our images be indeed very idols, and so all the prohibitions, laws, curses, threatenings of horrible plagues, as well temporal as eternal, contained in the Holy Scriptures, concerning idols and the makers, maintainers, and worshippers of them, belong also to our images set up in chambers and temples, and to the makers, maintainers and worshippers of them. And also these names of abomination which God's word in the Holy Scriptures giveth to the idols of the Gentiles belong to our images, being idols like to them. And God's own mouth in Holy Scripture calleth them vanities, lies, deceits, uncleanness, filthiness, dung, mischief, and abomination before the Lord. Wherefore God's horrible wrath and our most dreadful danger cannot be avoided, without the destruction and utter abolishing of all such images out of the Church and temple of God. Let us take heed, and be wise, O ye beloved of the Lord, and let us have no strange gods, but only one God, who made us when we were nothing, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who redeemed us when we were lost, together with his Holy Spirit, who doth sanctify us. For this is life everlasting, to know Him to be the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom He hath sent. Let us honour and worship for religion's sake none but Him; and Him let us honour and worship as He himself willeth, and hath declared by his word that He will be honoured and worshipped; not in or by images or idols,

which He hath most strictly forbidden, neither in kneeling to, lighting of candles, burning of incense, offering up of gifts unto images or idols, to believe that we shall please Him; for all these be abomination before God; but let us honour and worship God in spirit and in truth, fearing and loving Him above all things, trusting in Him only, calling upon Him, and praying to Him only, praising Him only, and all others in Him and for Him. For such worshippers doth our heavenly Father love, who is a most pure spirit, and therefore will be worshipped in spirit and in truth."

THE DOUAY BIBLE, ITS HISTORY AND AUTHORITY.

(Continued from page 88.)

We noticed, at the close of our last article on this subject, the very remarkable fact that, between the second and third editions of the Douay Old Testament no less than 114 years elapsed; whilst between the fourth and fifth editions of the Rheims Testament the interval was 105 years. On the principle that the supply is proportioned to the demand, we regard this fact as furnishing a most convincing proof that the study of the Scriptures, in the vernacular tongue, was almost wholly neglected for more than a century in these countries, and that the assertion of some eminent Roman Catholic authorities, such as the late Dr. Doyle, to the effect that the Church of Rome "has no aversion to the reading of the Bible, and to the possession of it by the laity," is not true.

It is no wonder if Roman Catholics, who set so little value on their own version of the Bible, should be found to disparage and vilify the Authorised Version of the Church of England. Accordingly, in the year 1688, and whilst James II. still sat on the throne, Thomas Ward published his famous book, entitled "The Errata to the Protestant Bible, &c." Ward had been originally a Protestant. In the reign of James II. he became a Roman Catholic, for reasons best known to himself. His admiration for his new faith led him to Italy, where he served for some time as a soldier in the Pope's guards. Like most converts, his animosity against his former faith was as bitter as his zeal for his new was fervent. Hence the rancorous malignity and utter want of fairness which characterise all his controversial writings, the "Errata" not excepted. He allows that the chief authority on which he relies, in this last work, is Gregory Martin's "Discovery, &c," a book which had been completely refuted upwards of a century before by Dr. W. Fulke, of Cambridge. Ward's "Errata," accordingly, fell still-born from the press, and had sunk for more than a century into the oblivion which it merited, when a new edition suddenly appeared in Dublin, about the beginning of the present century. It was answered by several Protestant divines, of whom the Rev. R. Grier is best known now. Three years after, 1810, it was again reprinted, with additional remarks, and a preface by Dr. Lingard, the well-known Roman Catholic historian. Another edition appeared in 1841, further enriched by a letter from the pen of Dr. Milner. To the credit of many of the most enlightened and liberal minded Roman Catholics it must be said, that they disapproved of the reprint of Ward's book, as a useless display of religious acrimony. Among these may be named the eminent Irish scholar, Dr. O'Connor, of Stowe. He thus expresses himself on the subject—"How wise it was to revive ancient heats, long consigned to oblivion, by reprinting Ward, I will leave to the secret hierarchy of invisible conscience to determine. Was it that the Church of England should correct its Bible? Certainly not. Was it to upbraid the independents who beheaded Charles I. with having corrupted the sacred text? Most undoubtedly not. Was it to fire the Irish Catholic against the English heretic? That would be too uncharitable. I will not suppose it." Dr. O'Connor was naturally unwilling to believe what he yet was unable to doubt. However, to return to the "Errata."

It is a truly remarkable fact, to which we have already directed the attention of our readers, that a large number of those renderings of the Protestant Bible which Ward stigmatizes as *heretical corruptions*, have been adopted in the more recent editions of the Douay Bible, and are actually to be found, at the present hour, in the edition sanctioned by the late Dr. Murray, Roman Catholic Archbishop in Dublin.¹³ It is a very striking and instructive instance of false accusations recoiling on the heads of their authors and propagators.

More than a century, as we have said, had elapsed since an edition of the Roman Catholic version, either of the New or Old Testament, had been printed. The language, which from the first was inelegant and obscure, had become obsolete and almost unintelligible to the greater part of the people. To remedy this evil, Dr. Challoner, one of the Vicars-apostolic of England, published, in the year 1749, a revised translation of the

⁸ Origen. Contra Celsum, lib. viii., Tom. i., p. 755. Ed. Ben.

⁹ Id. lib. vi. p. 640.

¹⁰ Arnobius adv. Gentes, lib. vi., p. 195.

¹¹ Minuc. Felix. Octav. pp. 217, 220.

¹² Lactant. Divin. Instit., lib. ii. sec. 2, p. 141. Lugd. Batav., 1660.

¹³ Id. p. 145, 146.

¹⁴ Vide Epiph. ad Joan. Episc. Hier. in Oper. Hieron. Tom. ii. p. 177. See CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. II, p. 50.

¹⁵ Because the errors—"corruptions," as they were called—in the earlier English versions of the Bible (Cranmer's, The Bishop's, and the Geneva) had been already corrected in the authorized version, which alone was in use.

¹⁶ See, especially, two valuable pamphlets addressed by the late Rev. George Hamilton to Archbishop Murray, and published in the year 1825 and 1829. See also the articles in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN referred to in page 57, col. ii., N. a.

New Testament, and the following year, one of the Old. This version professes to be the Douay, "newly revised and corrected according to the Clementine edition of the Scriptures."

The text of the Old Testament, as revised by Dr. Challoner in 1750, and that of his third edition of the New Testament, published in 1752, have formed the basis of all subsequent editions to the present day. He borrowed freely words and phrases from the Protestant Authorized Version. Indeed, there are hundreds of verses nearly identical with those of the Authorized Version, the slight differences being obviously intended to avoid the appearance of a too close conformity with an heretical translation.

Before we pass on to the next stage in the history of the Douay Bible, we may notice the attempt at a new English translation of the Bible made by Dr. Geddes, a Roman Catholic priest of considerable literary attainments. We are very far, indeed, from approving of his views respecting the inspiration of the Bible; we merely quote his opinion of the Douay Version, as compared with the Authorized. In 1792 he published the first volume of his own version, containing the Old Testament as far as the Book of Joshua. His labours met with violent opposition from many members of his own communion, especially the clergy. This opposition he himself ascribed to his known attachment to the "Catholic Committee," which numbered amongst its members some of the first Roman Catholic laymen in England, and had as its secretary the eminent Charles Butler. The object of this association was to resist the perpetual encroachment made by the clergy on their civil rights and liberties. However this may be, Dr. Geddes, in the vindication of his version, published the following year, 1793, uses the following remarkable language relative to the Douay translation and the Protestant authorised version, respectively: "My primary motive was, to give a tolerable, and, if I could, a *credible* version of the Holy Bible, for the use of the English Catholics. The greater part of the Roman Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland might be said to be without a Bible. The common national version (the authorised) they would not use, because (forsooth) it was the work of heretics, and because, as they pretended, it was unfairly translated; and also because several books which the Council of Trent had declared to be canonical were either entirely omitted in the editions of the common version or accounted apocryphal. Precluded thus from the use of the common version, they had no alternative for more than a century (i.e., from 1608-9 to 1749-50) but to put up with a barbarous translation, made at Rheims and Douay, from an uncorrected copy of the Latin Vulgate, accompanied with virulent annotations against the Protestant religion, and manifestly calculated to support a system, not of genuine Catholicity, but of transalpine Popery. About the middle of the present century (the 18th) it was, indeed, remodelled on the Clementine edition of the Vulgate, and modernized into somewhat better English by the late Dr. Challoner, who put in into a more convenient form, and stript it of almost all its most odious notes; yet still, in those which he retained or altered, the spirit of theologic system is but too visible; and as to the translation itself (Dr. Challoner's), the changes in it are chiefly made from that same common version which had been so much vilified and burlesqued by our rhymers and divines."

The next stage in the Roman Catholic version of the Bible presents us with a novel and remarkable phenomenon—viz., a *Roman Catholic Bible Society*.

Hitherto the circulation of the Scriptures in the English tongue was extremely limited amongst the Roman Catholics of these realms. In Ireland especially there was a great scarcity of copies of the Bible. At length, about the beginning of the year 1813, several Protestant gentlemen in London formed the design of supplying the deficiency to some extent, by re-printing the Douay Bible and Rheims Testament without notes, and distributing them either gratuitously or at a low price, as circumstances might render most advisable. This movement on the part of Protestants attracted the notice and stirred up the activity of the "Catholic Board," then sitting in London, and anxiously engaged about a petition to the House of Commons for "Catholic Relief." At a meeting of the "Board," held at the Earl of Shrewsbury's, March 8th, 1813, Lord Clifford in the chair, it was resolved—

I. "That this board are of opinion that it is highly desirable to have a subscription entered into by the Roman Catholics of Great Britain for the purpose of promoting a gratuitous distribution of the Holy Scriptures."

II. "That a committee for carrying this resolution into effect be appointed at the next meeting of the board."

Accordingly, at the next meeting, held on the 13th, a committee of seven was appointed, consisting of the Right Rev. Dr. Poynter, Vicar Apostolic of the London district, Lord Clifford, Hon. Robert Clifford, Sir John Throckmorton, Bart., Anthony R. Blake, Esq., John Menzies, Esq., and James Kiernan, Esq. A plan was drawn up and presented to the board a few days after for promoting the distribution of the Scriptures amongst the Roman Catholics, the first rule of which runs as

follows—"That a Society be formed from among the Roman Catholics of Great Britain for the purpose of facilitating the distribution of the Holy Scriptures, and particularly the New Testament, amongst the poor of the Catholic communion; and that the same be denominated 'THE ROMAN CATHOLIC BIBLE SOCIETY,' and shall consist of such persons as shall be subscribers thereto of one guinea and upwards annually." A negotiation was, meanwhile, going on with the Protestant association above mentioned and the Roman Catholic Bible Committee were empowered to confer with Mr. Blair, the secretary of that association, upon the subject of co-operation with him and his friends. But the negotiation came to nothing; and Mr. Blair was informed that, upon further consideration, the Bible Committee declined the proposed co-operation, as it would be of no use, and could not lead to anything, as their plan was so different from Mr. Blair's. The difference of plan consisted mainly in this, that the Protestant association wished to print the Roman Catholic version *without* the notes, whilst the Roman Catholic Bible Society would not consent to the omission of the notes. The Bible Committee, after some hesitation as to the edition of the New Testament which they should follow, at length fixed on the first edition of Dr. Challoner, 1749; and in 1815 they published their edition of the New Testament, stereotyped.

A preliminary address was prefixed, from the pen of Dr. Poynter, the president of the society. Amongst other statements, it contains the following:—"Surely, the sacred Scriptures have not been neglected in the Roman Catholic Church, nor withheld from the Catholic public; surely Scriptural truth has been faithfully preserved, and freely disseminated by this most ancient and widely established society." The text, with one slight variation, and all the notes, with one exception, are taken from Dr. Challoner's first edition of 1749; about twenty of his notes are wholly omitted. From many others the controversial parts and the abusive expressions are withdrawn, agreeably to a resolution of the board, "that all such notes as are offensive to the just feelings of our Christian brethren be omitted." This Christian moderation and charity did not, however, meet with the approbation of the more bigotted portion of the Roman Catholic communion. Dr. Milner, who, from the beginning, set his face against the society, remarked bitterly of the notes, that *almost every note* of Bishop Challoner's edition, that was necessary for rendering the Testament safe (!) in the hands of the ignorant was left out of the stereotype edition—(Suppl. Mem. of English Catholics, p. 243). In the same work he speaks with pious horror, of "so strange and unheard of an institution as that of a Catholic Bible Society, announcing in its very title a departure from the Catholic rule of faith." He asserts that it would be a portentous sight to the pious and well-informed Catholics of the Continent to see their English brethren forming themselves into a Bible Society. When he wrote this, it was notorious, and must have been well known to him especially, that Roman Catholic Bible Societies had been established in several parts of the Continent. That at Paris was more than a century old. Hanover, Russia, and Poland had also their respective Bible Societies, under the sanction of their national clergy. In a favourite organ of his (Orthodox Journal, volume vii.), Dr. Milner also gives expression to his indignation in the following terms: "Its boasted stereotype New Testament, at the same time that it betrayed the Catholic truth in its mutilated notes, was proved to abound with the most numerous and gross errors: hardly a copy of it could be sold, and, in the end, the plates for continuing it have been of late presented by an illustrious personage, into whose hands they fell, to one of our prelates, who will, undoubtedly, employ the cart-load of them for a good purpose, by disposing of them to some pewterer, who will convert them into numerous useful culinary implements, gas light pipes, and other pipes." As a commentary on the above criticism on the text of this edition, it is enough to say, that in the year 1826 an exact reprint of it appeared in Dublin, printed also in stereotype by the Roman Catholic bookseller, Coyne, and bearing the approbation of the four Roman Catholic Archbishops, Drs. Curtis, Laffan, Murray, and Kelly. It contains, moreover, all the notes of the same edition of 1815.

Our space will not permit us, at present, to do more than notice the two editions of the Roman Catholic Bible published in 1816 and 1818, at Cork and Dublin, under the sanction of Dr. Troy and other Roman Catholic Prelates. We pass on to the year 1825, when a new edition, in stereotype, was brought out in Dublin by Coyne, under the sanction of Dr. Murray, titular Archbishop of Dublin. The text in the Old Testament

appears to be formed on that of Dr. Troy's Bible of 1816, which is itself based on that of Dr. Challoner's, 1750. In the New Testament rather it follows Dr. Challoner's early editions of 1749 and 1750. The Notes generally agree with those of Dr. Challoner. In the Old Testament, about 37 of his notes are omitted; about 50 are altered; and about 97 new ones are added, from various sources. In the New Testament, 5 of Dr. Challoner's notes are omitted; about 44 are altered; and about 50 new ones are added.⁵

This Bible justified the expectations entertained of it. It gave great satisfaction to the Roman Catholic public, and has become a sort of *standard* or *exemplar*. It has been followed, in great measure, in the Bibles published at Belfast, under the sanction of Dr. Crotty and Dr. Denvir; and in those published in Great Britain, under the sanction of the Vicars Apostolic.⁶

We shall conclude this historical sketch with noticing briefly the "New Version of the Gospels," published anonymously by the celebrated Dr. Lingard in 1836.⁷ In general, he translates directly from the Greek text; and in several notes gives his reasons for preferring it to the Latin Vulgate. He puts forth the distinctive dogmas of his Church with great moderation, and studiously avoids the language of controversy. In many passages his translations approach nearer to the Authorized Version than to any of the previous Roman Catholic ones; of which (including even the Rheims) he never once makes mention. A striking instance occurs in the well-known passage, the Salutation of the Virgin. While all other Roman Catholic translators render, "Hail, full of grace!" Dr. Lingard follows the Authorised Version, rendering, "Hail, thou favoured of God," and adds this note:—"καταρτισμένη—gratia plena." These words are explained by the angel himself, v. 30:—"Thou hast found favour (χαριτι, gratiam) with God." The grace or favour was not inherent in the Virgin, but imparted to her by God.⁸

It is not surprising that a version so candid and moderate as this should be coldly received by the Romish hierarchy. The *Dublin Review*, the principal literary organ of the Ultramontane party, speaks of it in an article written by Dr. Wiseman,⁹ in a cautious and almost disparaging tone. If we contrast the language of that article with the terms of admiration bestowed on Dr. Lingard upon many other occasions, we shall easily see that he was here on forbidden ground, and had transgressed the limits which Papal orthodoxy prescribes to the biblical critic and interpreter.

In the above cited article of the *Dublin Review*, we meet with some striking admissions as to the present state of biblical learning amongst the Romish clergy, and the authority of the Bible versions in general use, which will form a suitable conclusion to the remarks which we have made on the subject. "The appearance of any work upon biblical literature is unfortunately a phenomenon amongst us. We are utterly unprovided with even elementary and introductory works upon biblical studies, whether intended for the education of our clergy or for the instruction of our people. We possess not a commentary suited to the wants of the times, or the advances made in biblical science; and are obliged to seek information either in voluminous, rare, and old writers, or in the productions of men whose religion differs essentially from ours. The proof of the existence of attention to biblical learning which is most imperatively called for is a revision and correction of that version now in use among Catholics known by the name of the Douay Version. To call it any longer the Douay or Rheims Version is an abuse of terms. It has been altered and modified till scarcely any verse remains as it was originally published; for, though Dr. Challoner did well to alter many too decided Latinisms, he weakened the language considerably. But it had been well if Dr. Challoner's alterations had given stability to the text, and formed a standard to which subsequent editors had conformed; but far from this being the case, new and often important modifications have been made in every edition which has followed, till at length many may appear rather new versions than revisions of the old. We believe Catholic Britain to be the only country where such a laxity of attention has existed in regard to the purity of its authorized version. The mass of typographical errors to be found in some editions is quite frightful. By settling a standard text, and in this manner alone, will the Catholics of the empire be provided with what every other portion of the Church has long since possessed." And as to the ultimate authority of the Vulgate, Cardinal Wiseman thus speaks: "A new revision would impose the necessity of a minute and often complicated study of the original text. At first sight, it might appear an almost superfluous task to proceed beyond the accurate

⁵ Dr. Cotton, l. c., p. 124.

⁶ The publication of this edition of Dr. Murray's led to an important result, as regards the College of Maynooth; for it gave rise to an order by the trustees, that every student at his entrance should possess himself of a Bible, which was now obtainable at a comparatively moderate price; whereas, previously, from the heavy cost of a copy (even a second hand one could not be procured for less than a guinea), there was scarcely a dozen Bibles or Testaments to be found in a whole class, consisting of a hundred and fifty or more.—*Eighth Report on Education in Ireland*.

⁷ Dr. Cotton, l. c., p. 135.

⁸ Other instances of candour and faithfulness, on the part of Dr. Lingard, are given in Dr. Cotton, l. c., pp. 136-7.

⁹ See *Dublin Review*, April, 1837. Essays by Cardinal Wiseman, vol. 1, p. 78, sq.

^c Vide Cotton, l. c., p. 99.

^d Dr. Milner says that this was done in order to meet to some extent the wishes of Mr. Charles Butler, who contended that the Testament ought to be published without any notes.

^e Dr. Milner's exultation over the supposed fate of those stereotype plates was, happily, premature and groundless. They were used by dagger for an edition of the New Testament, published by him in 1823, and of which copies are still in circulation.

^f For the full history of this very remarkable transaction, we refer to the Preface to the Rev. R. J. McGehee's "Complete Notes of the Douay Bible and Rheims Testament;" and to Dr. Cotton, l. c., p. p. 110, 116.

study of the *Vulgate* itself; but it is impossible to discover the mistakes of the *Douay Version*, without a constant recourse to the original Hebrew and Greek texts, to decide the true meaning of expressions obscure or doubtful in the Latin."

The above remarks, with the whole history on which they furnish so apt a commentary, we submit to the most serious attention of those Roman Catholics who have been led to suppose that, on the one hand, their Church has been at all times, and now is, deeply concerned about the integrity and purity of Holy Scriptures; solicitous about the education of a clergy duly qualified to expound its contents; and anxious for its general dissemination amongst all classes of the faithful; while, on the other hand, the reformed Church of England and Ireland has been labouring for three centuries to obscure and pervert the Word of God, and to substitute the "Gospel of Satan" for the Gospel of Christ.

THE DUMB VILLAGE.

CHAPTER II.

SOME of our friends have, no doubt, been exercising their conjectural skill upon the narrative contained in our previous article. Others of our readers have, perhaps, jumped to the conclusion, either that it was merely intended thereby to amuse them by a fictitious story, or, at all events, that whatever portion of truth was contained therein, resembled Falstaff's reasons, which were like two grains of wheat hid in two bushels of chaff, for the which you may seek all the day without finding, and if found, not worth the search. We can, however, assure them, that facts are the foundation of the story.

Those who read the riddle aright have, of course, concluded the village to be in Ireland. So it is. They have been also so sharp-witted as to discover "the Dumb Village" to be simply neither more nor less than a community of our Roman Catholic countrymen prohibited by their religious advisers from all intercourse with their Protestant neighbours—Scripture-readers and others—hitherto mingling with them in cordial good will, which became for a time suddenly and imperiously broken. With this key to the mystery, our readers can now judge both of their own guesses and the fairness of our description.

Some of the Roman Catholic villagers greatly loved and respected the Scripture-readers, from whose conversation they had derived both profit and enjoyment. They therefore secretly fretted under the prohibition of silence which precluded them from intercourse with men whom they really esteemed; and thoroughly disliked an exercise of authority to which they reluctantly submitted. They endeavoured, by many little ways, to show they were no willing agents in the matter. And, as commonly occurs in like cases, curiously kept "the letter of the law" while detesting and violating its spirit. Others, though they were few, unfriendly and embittered, rather welcomed than shunned such an occasion of exhibiting the hostility which they felt.

This unhappy disunion, rigorously enforced, continued so long, and proved so distressing, that it at last became a serious question with some of the Protestant inhabitants, whether it would not be better to leave the village altogether. The Scripture-readers in particular, who were men of rare piety, felt sorely grieved and disturbed by the steadiness with which they were avoided. But, as those who are very much in earnest are often very observant, one or two among them conjectured that a change, if patiently awaited, would certainly take place. This they thought, partly, because being especial favourites, they had many occasions of witnessing a genuine kindness of heart which they believed too deep to be thus effectually extinguished, and partly because they saw quite enough to convince them there was a grievous violence done to that good-natured friendliness which they had taken so much pains to cultivate, and so often experienced.

Our pretty and gentle friend Mary had, as our fair friends who are versed in these matters probably anticipated, given, in all loving faith, her true heart to the young man of whom we have spoken. He was a sincere Christian, and had long laboured earnestly for the soul of her whom he so loved. Mary's mother was, as most Irish mothers are, a tender parent. She could not but secretly acknowledge her daughter's choice to be all her affection could desire, save in the terrible bar of an opposing religion. Pride and thankfulness contended with her fears. But her own, as well as her daughter's convictions had been seriously, though insensibly, shaken by the power (new to them) of the truth which the young man enforced with an earnest spirit and great gentleness. They listened eagerly, and almost unconsciously, to doctrines which comforted and elevated them. And felt, they knew not how, strange stirrings of soul, as they both gazed with interest and admiration upon his kindling cheek, and heard truths almost realisable, which sprang from his heart to his lips. The word of God had been, almost unnoticed, winning its sure and silent way within them, and their deep silence, which often followed some burst of (to them) unwonted eloquence, bore witness to its effect. But the prohibition came, and it was to them a sore burden, al-

most too heavy to bear. The good woman grieved over her own and her daughter's faithfulness to this cruel command, as she saw Mary's sweet face pale, day by day, with the heart-sorrow which smote her. She watched with a mother's anxiety, and mourned with a mother's love, the silent suffering which she shared, but could not soothe. And yearned for some deliverance from the misery of witnessing the anguish of a strife between her daughter's faithfulness to her religion and devotion to her love.

Yet what could she do, and how could she hope? "The power of the Church"—that dread authority to an Irish peasant—had been brought to bear on her, and on every Roman Catholic inhabitant of the village. All intercourse "in word or deed," with their Protestant neighbours—and with the Scripture-readers especially—had been rigorously interdicted, under penalties, whose terrors left no room for reflection upon their unreasonableness and injustice. Poor Mary's fears bowed, while her heart well nigh broke.

Some wise and anxious watchers over the progress of the Irish Reformation ("Restoration" would be the better term) had confidently asserted that many of the steps taken by the Roman Catholic hierarchy and clergy in order to check it would ultimately defeat their expectations, and must, if persevered in, tend greatly to diminish, instead of advancing, their influence with the Irish people. Not only because they were unchristian in principle, and of distressing cruelty in practice. But also because the loss, which obedience to them occasioned, would, in the end, press so heavily as to produce both disaffection and disobedience. If, it was urged, Roman Catholic farmers were, in order to deter conversions, constrained by priestly injunctions, to become agents of persecution, by dismissing, and refusing to employ men who had no other fault to be laid against them than that of daring to exercise the liberty which God gave them, at the command of those claiming to be his ministers, they would soon discover, that they could not thus wrong others without injuring themselves. The converts were among their very best workmen. If, then, they were not only constrained to dismiss them all, but if, also, they should be forced, when seasons of demand for labour naturally raises its price (the supply of labour being already seriously affected, and therefore its rate of payment raised, by emigration), to endure an additional augmentation of wages produced by another decrease in the amount of labour available for them through the exclusion of converts, who were, moreover, willing to work almost at any price, the loss to their pockets would, it was confidently asserted, at last open their eyes to the fact, that the shameful game which they were playing was just as expensive to them as it was cruel and unchristian for all engaged in it. And thus dispose them to deliver others from oppression, in order to relieve themselves from a burden which they found to be overcostly for long endurance. Paying dearly for submission, they were, moreover, paying just in the way which brought discredit upon their religion, as well as disgrace and injury upon themselves. The consequences of such intolerance, it was then argued, would be—reluctant submission to it for a while, until the shoe pinched too severely, and growing disaffection to a system which entailed both loss and shame.

Roman Catholic shopkeepers were placed in the same position. With the same object in view, they were, it was publicly stated, prohibited in certain instances, from selling at all to converts; or at exorbitant prices. In one well-known locality the result of this was, as a matter of necessity, the establishment of a convert shop. To this the converts, of course, all flocked. But in addition to them, from the excellence of the goods, the justness of weights and measures, and the reasonableness of the prices, Roman Catholics were attracted in considerable numbers, and became constant and satisfied purchasers to such an extent, as to produce a serious diminution, and to threaten further injury in the trade of those who, by lending themselves to oppression, had forced the necessity for a rival establishment. They soon felt, and deplored the loss which they had occasioned to themselves, and sought the removal of the restriction which was ruining them, much more readily than they accepted its imposition for the sake of injuring others. A religion which employs such means will sooner or later be thought to require them. This will bring distrust of its truth. Many an honest and honourable Roman Catholic in Ireland sees and deplores the danger to his own faith, which its ministers in many cases occasion by the oppression which they sanction. Those who have closely watched for indications of feeling, have reason to believe that the Roman Catholic peasant, in certain localities at least, is much more kindly disposed towards his convert neighbours, than his outward demeanour would lead less observant persons at all to suspect.

The inhabitants of the dumb village, after some time, began to find the command of silence more irksome than heretofore. They felt in no small degree ashamed to deal thus harshly towards men who endured so patiently. By degrees many a kind glance indicated the strife between outward obedience and inward revolt. Small violations of the prohibition commenced and increased. An Irishman can stand a beating better than a joke which tells against him. When the thaw began, some uncommonly good-humoured and amusing allusions were,

as occasions allowed, made by the Scripture-readers to recent events. Sly and comic congratulations on the recovery of their speech told wonderfully well. The good fellows now and then "poked a little fun" at their neighbours which was irresistible. Laughter got in, and enmity got out. And the issue was, a renewal of intercourse springing up with the freshness of a retarded spring, all the more friendly because of the interruption.

Poor Mary had unexpectedly and unintentionally given way. As she took a lonely and sorrowing walk, she accidentally met the young man whom she loved so well. Though she tried to avoid him, and feared to speak, she was by his affectionate and manly entreaty forced to listen, until, at last, she forgot all but her love, and found the full use of her tongue. Trembling and dismayed, she told all to her mother, who, if the truth is to be told, was nearly as happy as her daughter, and wept as she comforted and embraced her. Mary's kind friend, the lord of the manor, had accidentally overheard part of their evening's conversation. Hence his visit to her cottage, and the whisper which showed her that he knew more than she suspected.

Naturally, there are few people more warm-hearted than the Irish peasantry. If half the pains which have been taken to stimulate their evil passions, and to trade on them, had been expended in the culture of their genuine good qualities, those who truly know and love them would not have need to mourn so often over acts which stain their history, and do violence to their nature. The tenacity with which they adhere to their faith; the unreservedness of their obedience to their clergy, ought to make us sorrow the more for their misdirected piety, and labour to turn it to truth. If the fast runner swerve from the right path, his fleetness of foot only serves to carry him further in "the error of his way." An Irishman loves controversy because he has an appetite for it, and having likewise an hereditary respect for religion, he is, from the quickness of his apprehension, warmth of heart, and temperamental piety, one of the most hopeful soils for the reception and growth of truth.

A very different state of things soon sprang up in the Dumb Village, which speedily became a loquacious one. Both parties were on the best terms. The priest of the parish had soon perceived that he was trying his people too much, and that to insist longer on the prohibition would tend greatly to weaken his influence. In fact, he had been constrained by his superior to adopt a course which he knew to be unwise. Thoroughly satisfied of the truth of his religion, and ardently attached to it, he groaned over the degradation, that the faith which he loved was to have no other resource, in times of assault than to shelter itself from danger under the prohibition of intercourse with Protestants. He could scarcely avoid the rebellious thought that those who forced this measure upon himself and others were more likely to occasion suspicion than to promote confidence. He could not avoid the disparaging comparison between them and a certain crafty general, who, doubting the valour of his troops, dressed up a set of old women in military attire, and commanded them to march, with all display, towards the battle-field, in the hope that his "make believe" for the soldiers would, in the confusion of a doubtful fight, be mistaken for a reinforcement.

His religious training could never so wholly subjugate him to do the Church's work as to annihilate, in these matters, the honesty of his character and extinguish the ardour of his Irish temperament. There still survived in him a constitutional candour, which, though it made him less of an ecclesiastical serf, made him more of an upright man. And he could not see why, in order to serve his religion, he must first lose his self-esteem, by using means for its advancement, from which, though his Church commanded them, his conscience revolted.

Under these circumstances, his position was painful and difficult. Religious discussions were increasing in his parish. He was required to suppress them in a way which he felt to be unworthy, and knew to be unavailing. Remonstrance from him was useless. He was ordered to obey, and forbidden to question the directions he had received, with the accompaniment, that a state of things produced (it was so intimated) by his remissness must be corrected—by any methods which were possible.

Steadily and manfully did he address himself to contemplate his difficulties and to master them. But the more he considered, the more he felt them. The Scripture-readers had been "handled" in a manner which surprised and perplexed him by the rector of the parish, who never allowed others to do for him what he knew it was his duty to do for himself. They were admirably chosen, and fitted for their work. Earnest, intelligent, and pious men, who rarely omitted a suitable opportunity of addressing his people with a singleness of purpose which gained them great respect. He saw many, who seemed unmoved by their arguments, to be favourably impressed by their conduct. Carefully as he had watched them, there was one watching them more carefully still, and he well knew that all their movements were made under the direction of the Protestant clergyman, whose vigilance never seemed to relax.

The Scripture-readers had succeeded so far as to produce among his flock a very general impression, that their religion, if it shunned inquiry, was somewhat like